

**Summary
Interagency Vegetation Workgroup
November 2001**

1. Introduction and to Remind Group of their Focus -
 1. To create better statewide veg data
 1. More specifically - Two Goals
 - (1) Short-term - stitch together statewide map from existing efforts
 - (1) CDF/USFS
 - (2) Burec - Central Valley
 - (3) DFG - Mojave
 - (2) Long-term
 2. Find long-term funding for improved vegetation mapping
 - (1) Make only minor tweaks in status-quo until better funding secured
 3. Short-term goal in progress - CDF work - Any major issues? If so, discuss at next meeting, not here
 4. Long-term goal - main focus of this meeting
 1. We recognize at least three types of uses of vegetation data
 - (1) Local uses
 - (1) need quite detailed (at least 1:24K)
 - (2) needed everywhere in state
 2. Regional or Statewide uses
 - (1) Don't need detailed, but should aggregate detailed data into information that shows patterns at broader scale and can be manipulated relatively easily (no giga-files, please)
 3. Probably have to create different Ascale@products for each level of use
 - (1) All different Ascale@products need to be compatible with each other, allowing the user to see links between different products for the same geographic area
 4. Riparian and wetlands will be a separate product due to need for finer grain mapping and importance of these habitats
 5. Confirm our group's strategy to achieve goal
 1. Develop standards for different types of uses
 2. Provide these standards to everyone mapping vegetation and encourage them to use them
 3. Develop options for data development to achieve standards
 4. Develop issue paper that describes pros/cons of different options
 5. Seek guidance on preferred options from CBC and GIS Council and work with them to get the necessary funding
 6. Sketch of issue paper

Optional Approaches	Products	
	Minimally Acceptable by All	Reasonable Improvement over Minimal
A	How well does approach meet standards? How much does it cost? What do/don't you get from it?	
B		
C		

2. Meeting Agenda
 1. **Understanding Different Perspectives/needs**
 1. Review individual matrices of standards
 - (1) Ray goes over each matrix, showing general agreements and differences - no debates, questions only for clarification, encourage them to understand that we have a limited amount of time in the meeting and we want to achieve our desired end, seek their help to stay focused, on schedule and to understand when we cut them off of a digression)
 - (2) Ray summarizes major differences (classification, update frequency, etc.)
 - (3) No need to resolve differences. We need to put them into a series of optional choices with pros and cons of each. In some cases
 2. Some information missing from matrix framework, which focused mostly on mapping standards, rather than on information content
 - (1) Need to understand the variety of more specific uses (plant assessment vs animal assessment, for example) and the different types of information needed for each use - review Marc's table to highlight these options
 2. **Designing Minimally Acceptable Long-term Product** - For those major differences at the most local level of data:
 1. What could be accommodated by providing additional attributes in the coverage? (Classification, perhaps, could show CalVeg, MCV, and dominant species fields)
 2. For remaining differences, what are minimally acceptable mapping standards and types of information? (If these specifics are not used/included, your agency is not willing to participate)
 3. **Designing Reasonable Improvements over Minimal Product** - Compared to what our current approaches, what would be reasonable improvements over the next 3-5 years?
 1. Ideas include positional accuracy, MMU, frequency of update, type of information, etc.
 4. **Option Identification** - Identify 2-3 different options each for achieving both types of products
 5. **Next steps on Issue Paper** - Identify individuals or groups to evaluate each option and to draft up sections of issue paper
3. Next meeting - options for agenda
 1. Resolve issues related to short-term stitched map, if any
 2. Review drafts and improve them
 3. Identify what could be done to make a stronger case for improved funding
 1. Document need for better map?
 2. Test different approaches on same piece of land to validate our assessments?
 4. How to promote use of standards among others